## 2:04-cv-73369-GER-WC Doc # 1 Filed 08/30/04 Pg 1 of 7 Pg ID 1 RECEIPT NUMBER 4/2972



## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION MACISTRATE JUDGE CAPEL,

CO/OP OPTICAL VISION DESIGNS, assumed name for COOPERATIVE OPTICAL SERVICS, INC.,

A Michigan corporation,

JUDGE: Rosen, Gerald E.

DECK : S. Division Civil Deck DATE : 08/30/2004 @ 13:32:27

CASE NUMBER : 2:04CV73369

CMP CO/OP OPTICAL V. LOCAL 84932

(KC)

Plaintiff,

-VS-

LOCAL 84932, UNITED OPTICAL WORKERS, of Detroit, Michigan, attiliated with the INTERNATIONAL UNION of ELECTRICAL WORKERS-COMMINICATION WORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO,

Defendants.

## ACTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD

NOW COMES the plaintiff, by and through its attorney, William S. Stern, and who files this action to vacate an arbitration award for the following reasons:

- 1. Jurisdiction in this Court arises due to the fact that this action is brought pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act, specifically 9 USC §10, that allows a Court to vacate an arbitration award upon the application of any party to the arbitration for various reasons. Jurisdiction also arises as this action requests a finding that a decision of an arbitrator concerning the terms of a Collective Bargaining Agreement violated the terms and spirit of the National Labor Relations Act, specifically 29 USC 158(d).
- 2. The plaintiff is an employer engaged in providing optical eye care as well as the manufacturing and retail sales of optical wear.
- 3. The defendant herein is a union representing employees of the plaintiff.
- 4. The arbitration in this case arose due to a dispute concerning the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement dated May 15, 2002 between the plaintiff and

'defendant when the plaintiff in 2003 transferred employees to various retail establishments without posting the positions.

- 5. The defendant union objected to the transfers and filed a grievance that was denied by the plaintiff. The basis for the denial by the plaintiff was the contention that the Collective Bargaining Agreement did not prohibit the unilateral transfer of employees and therefore, the right to unilaterally transfer employees from one location to another was a right reserved to management pursuant to ARTICLE XVI, Section 1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement that states that the "usual and customary rights of management not specifically modified or abridged by the terms of this Agreement remain the rights of management".
- 6. An additional reason that the plaintiff denied the grievance was that the union during the earliest stage of the grievance hearing, right up to the arbitration that is the subject of this suit, refused to disclose the identities of individual employees who claimed that they were aggrieved pursuant to the right given to the plaintiff under ARTICLE XII, Section II of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The union steward who did appear refused to disclose the identities of employees who objected to the transfers so that the concerns of those employees could have been addressed.
- 7. Pursuant to the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the defendant on December 31, 2003 filed a Demand for Arbitration with the American Arbitration Association.
- 8. A hearing was held at the American Arbitration Association on June 30, 2004 and a decision was issued by the arbitrator on August 20, 2004 finding in favor of the defendants and ordering that the employees be returned to their earlier stores and that any

costs incurred by the aggrieved employees be reimbursed by the plaintiff to the employees.

- 9. The plaintiff files this action as it contends that the arbitration award should be vacated pursuant to 9 USC §10(a)(1) as the award was procured by undue means when the arbitrator allowed the union to produce parol evidence concerning prior contracts and negotiations that led to the present Collective Bargaining Agreement in order to contradict the unambiguous Collective Bargaining Agreement in support of the union contention that the Collective Bargaining Agreement prohibited the unilateral transfer of employees to other locations even though such language was not explicitly contained in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- 10. The plaintiff files this action as it contends that the arbitration award should be vacated pursuant to 9 USC §10(a)(1) as the award was procured by undue means when the company was "blindsided" as the union was allowed to produce witnesses of employees who claimed that they were objecting to the unilateral transfer of employees when the plaintiff demanded to know the identities and exact objections of all such employees at the earlier stage of the grievance process so that such concerns could have been addressed and perhaps resolved before the arbitration hearing.
- 11. The plaintiff contends that the arbitration award should be vacated pursuant to the terms of 9 USC §10(a)(3) which allows vacation of an arbitration award due to the misbehavior of the arbitrator when the rights of any party have been prejudiced when the arbitrator allowed the union to produce parol evidence concerning prior contracts and negotiations that led to the present Collective Bargaining Agreement in order to contradict the unambiguous Collective Bargaining Agreement in support of the union

- contention that the Collective Bargaining Agreement prohibited the unilateral transfer of employees to other locations even though such action was not explicitly prohibited pursuant to the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- 12. The plaintiff contends that the arbitration award should be vacated pursuant to the terms of 9 USC §10(a)(3) which allows vacation of an arbitration award due to the misbehavior of the arbitrator when the rights of any party have been prejudiced when the company was "blindsided" when the union was allowed to produce witnesses of employees who claimed that they were objecting to the unilateral transfer of employees when the plaintiff demanded to know the identities and exact objections of all such employees at the earlier stage of the grievance process so that such concerns could have been addressed before the arbitration hearing.
- 13. The plaintiff contends that the arbitration award should be vacated pursuant to the terms of 9 USC §10(a)(1),(3) & (4) where the arbitrator exceeded his powers by allowing the parol evidence concerning prior contracts and negotiations that led to the present Collective Bargaining Agreement to contradict the unambiguous terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement of May 15, 2002 that did not prohibit the unilateral transfer of employees from one location to another when the agreement itself specifically stated that it was not to be modified pursuant to the terms of ARTICLE XXXVIII unless a specific procedure was followed and due to the fact that the Collective Bargaining Agreement in ARTICLE XII, Section 3, that prohibits an arbitrator from revising any of the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

- 14. There was no finding that the Collective Bargaining Agreement was ambiguous on the issue involved and therefore, it was improper to allow in the introduction of parol evidence.
- 15. The plaintiff further contends that even if the arbitrator would have made a finding that the Collective Bargaining Agreement was ambiguous on the issue of the unilateral transfer of employees to justify the introduction of parol evidence, that the defendant did not meet its burden of proof to show the intent of the parties included a prohibition on the unilateral transfer of employees from one location to another.
- 16. The plaintiff contends that the arbitration award should be vacated pursuant to the terms of 9 USC §10(a)(4) where the arbitrator exceeded his powers by allowing aggrieved employees to testify when the plaintiff demanded at earlier stages to know the names of the aggrieved employees so that their specific concerns could have been addressed at the earlier stage of the grievance process making the arbitration unnecessary.
- 17. The arbitration award should be vacated as the award is in conflict with federal labor policy as embodied in the National Labor Relations Act and is therefore in conflict with public policy, specifically 29 USC 158(d) which supports avoidance of labor strife and promotes peace in the labor arena by prohibiting a party to a collective bargaining agreement from terminating or modifying a collective bargaining agreement unless the party desiring the modification or termination follows a specific protocol as outlined in the statute.
- 18. The plaintiff is requesting an order staying the arbitration award until such time as the issues raised herein are addressed by the Court.

JS 44 11/99 CIV	04-cv-73369-GER-WC Doc	#1 Filed	08/30/04 P	g 6 of 7 Pg ID 6	oon /WC		
The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required							
I, (a) PLAINTIFFS	1		DEFENDAT	4-722	73369		
CO/OP OPTICAL	VISION DESIGNS, assure PERATIVE OPTICAL SERVI	med [CES,	LOCAL 849	932, UNITED OF OF DETROIDSE CALDROSE	N N		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Wayne			County of Residence of First Listed Wayne				
(b) County of Residence of First Dister			NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE				
(C) Attorney's (Firm Name	Address, and Telephone Number)	<del>)</del> —	LAND INVO Attorneys (If Know	wn)			
William S. St 24750 Lahser Southfield, N 248-353-9400	ern (P27396)		DonaldS6 17117 W. Southfie 248-559-	ld, MI 48075	EL, Suite 825		
	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		ENSHIP OF PR		ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		versity Cases Only) PLA of This State	——·	and One Box for Defendant) PLA DEF Principal Place X 4 X 4 In This State		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item 111)	Citizen	of Another	2 2 Incorporated an of Business	d Principal 5 5 5 5 1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		
	,		or Subject of a	3 3 Foreign Nation	6 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUI	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)		<u>-</u> -				
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORF	TTURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
1 1 0 Insurance 1 120 Marine 1 130 Miller Act 1 140 Negotiable Instrument 1 150 Recovery of	PERSONAL INJURY  31 0 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability  385 Personal Injury  Med. Malpra  385 Personal Injury  Product Liability	ijury-   62 ictice   62 iYry -	O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure of Property 21: 881 O Liquor Laws	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 400 State Reapportionment☐ 41 0 Antitrust☐ 430 Banks and Banking☐ 450 Commerce/ICC☐ 460 Deportation		
Overpayment and Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault Libel And Slander  368 Asbestos Pe		0 R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS	470 Racketeer Influenced &		
151 Medicare Act  152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability  Liability  ☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROF	□ 65 □ 68	0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  B10 Selective Service  B50 Securities/Commod titles/		
(Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	ding	0 Other		Exchange  875 Customer Challenge		
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits  190 Other Contract  195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal ☐ 360 Oth	mage 71 pility X0 72	LABOR  O Fair Labor Standards  Ad  O Vabor/Mgmt.  Selations	SOCIAL SECURITY    861 H   A (1 395ff)     862 Black Lung (923)     863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))     864 SSID Title XVI	12 LISC 3410  891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act		
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETI	730	Labor/Mgmt, Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	B95 Freedom of Information Act		
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations  Accommodations	74   79   1ty   Other   79	0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  B70 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)  B71 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609	900 Appeal of Fee     Determination Under     Equal Access to Justice      950 Constitutionality of     State Statutes     890 Other Statutory Actions		
V. ORIGIN (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)  Appeal to District							
Another district anothe							
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filling and write brief statement of cause.  Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)  9USC\$10 - Vacation of arbitration award							
29USC\$158(d) - National Labor RelationsAct  VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION SDEMAND CHECK YES only if demanded/in complaint:							
COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Yeb X No.							

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) instructions):
IF ANY

## # 68 PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11 The Control of the State of the Sta

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?		Yes
∎f yes, give	the following information:		(A) No
Court:			
Case No.: _			
Judge:	, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or particular discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this court, including state court? (Companion cases are it appears substantially similar evidence will be offer or related parties are present and the cases arise of transaction or occurrence.)	or any other e matters in which ered or the same	Yes No
If yes, give	e the following information:		
Court:			
Case No.:			
Judge:			
Notes:			